Douglas on the American Character, P. 3

Dodd's Pre-Summit Bombshell About the Pugwash Meetings Proves A Dud, See Page Two

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IX, NO. 21 JUNE 5, 1961 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Not One New Idea in the President's Travelling Bag

Writing as the President flies off to his meetings with de Gaulle, Khrushchov and Macmillan, the salient feature of the trip is that there is not a single new idea in Mr. Kennedy's travelling bag. Though the White House is full of supposed fresh new idea men, the President's diplomatic overnight kit seems to be packed with ideological underwear left over from the Truman-Acheson-Dulles era; artificial fabrics that can quickly be washed and dried but have long lost any glossy attraction they may have had. There is nothing visible in the bag which can meet the President's twin problems—the creation of a new confidence among our friends and a new respect among our antagonists.

Through de Gaulle's Eyes

In Paris, Vienna and London, the talks he faced called for a more subtle diplomacy than is likely to be supplied by the warmed over cold war clichés with which he had been regaling his domestic cheering section (a rather apathetic one) in Congress and the country in the week before the trip. Each of the three world leaders with whom he was to parley see their problems through spectacles of which the American public is hardly aware. De Gaulle is unwilling to put his country completely at the mercy of moves on which it is not consulted; he sees our actions in Laos as not only recklessly repeating France's own errors in Southeast Asia but rudely designed to push the French out of a dwindling sphere of influence; he regards our highly advertised anti-colonialism as a means whereby we take over the colonial world in our own way from our own allies, as we took over Iran from Britain. He fears that we will take over from France in North Africa by the same means, and he is engaged in a subtle game. He hopes to obtain Moscow's support for an Algerian settlement favorable to France by playing on Russia's fears of a renewed struggle in which North Africa will be torn apart between the U.S. and Red China. The latter is already dangerously influential with the Algerian Left and our own military-intelligence bureaucracy has long been sympathetic with the views of the Algerian rightists and the French army; these see the Algerian struggle not as a nationalist uprising but as a Communist plot to outflank NATO in North Africa. De Gaulle visions France as the keystone of a new imperial Third Force, buttressed on one side by West Germany and on the other by North Africa and those new French speaking African States which remain in the French zone of influence. This would change the face of the Western world and the character of NATO. This is not a problem which can be met by hearty handshakes and an offer of Polaris missiles. And if Mr. Kennedy tries in these circumstances to talk with de Gaulle about his new Freedom Doctrine, that lofty relic of the Eighteenth Century will feel that he is dealing with a Boy Scout.

The Way to Peace

"I remember one time Henry Stimson and I were talking after the war and I said, 'How do you get peace in the world?'

"'Well,' he said, 'I am not sure but I think the answer is that you bring people to Washington who think it is possible. When they get frustrated and tired, they go home, or you send them home and get more people who think it is possible and when they get frustrated and tired, send them home and get more people who think it's possible.' He said, 'Eventually you may get a more orderly rational world.'

"Now we have been here four months and we are not yet frustrated, we are not yet too tired and we still think things are possible. If the time ever comes when we don't think they are possible, then they ought to get rid of us."

—Undersecretary of State Chester Bowles, on ABC-TV's Issues and Answers, May 28.

In London, on his return from Vienna, Mr. Kennedy will find himself in a capital whose traditional reflex to change whether at home or abroad has been one of accommodation. The British Crown has survived by it; the British Empire remains a multi-racial Commonwealth thanks to it. Sometimes, as at Munich, this instinct for accommodation betrays the British into unwise policy but usually it has worked. It worked in India and Malaya; it's working in Africa and the West Indies. Associated with this characteristic, for which the British polity has a genius, is its balance-of-power attitude toward the Continent. Taken together, these explain Britain's repeated efforts to find an accommodation with the Soviet Union lest antagonism lead either to a disastrous war or to a prolonged tension in which Germany will again grow too powerful for Western Europe's safety. Hence Britain's repeated efforts via some scheme for disengagement or an atom free zone in Central Europe. In such a broader context, allaying her own fears and Russia's, Britain has seen the one way to solve the difficult problem of an isolated Berlin in a divided Germany. But Mr. Kennedy, in the wake of the Cuban fiasco, seems to have reverted to the same sterile rigidity on Berlin that marked U.S. policy when Adenauer and Dulles worked in tandem.

This unwillingness to compromise in any way on Berlin does not promise well for Mr. Kennedy's meeting with Mr. Khrushchov. The latter, by his long hesitation to play his final card and sign with the East Germans, shows how distrustful he, too, is of the Germans, albeit his own. But some way must be found at least to regularize, if not to solve, the problem of a divided Germany or it will make war more

(Continued on Page Four)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dodd and Senate Internal Security Picture U.S. Scientists As Weak-Minded

Pre-Summit Bombshell, Smearing the Pugwash Meetings, Turns Out A Dud

The tone of the report issued May 28 by the Senate Internal Security Committee on the Pugwash Conferences is that U.S. scientists are a gullible lot who cannot be trusted out without nursemaiding by skilled ideological sleuths. On page 67, with an air of discovery, the report says that the Prof. N. A. Talensky who took part in these conferences was *really* Major General Talensky, the noted Soviet military theoretician. "It is questionable," the report says sadly, "whether the American scientists who attended were fully aware of Talensky's background and career." But to answer this one need only turn to Appendix X of the report itself which provides the transcript of a TV round table discussion at MIT Jan. 3 among participants in the last Pugwash conference at Moscow. On page 108, one finds this colloquy about the Soviet representatives:

Mr. [Jerome] Wiesner: And then there were the two military boys, General Talenskii [sic] and Admiral Isakov who obviously had an important part to play in the development of military strategic doctrines in the Soviet Union.

Mr. [Richard S.] Leghorn: They are now military scientists, but one is an ex-admiral and one an ex-general.

Mr. Wiesner: Talianski [the name appears spelled three different ways in the Senate report—IFS] actually edits their military journal, I believe.

Our scientists not only were aware of who Talensky was but also knew that Academician Isakov had been an Admiral, which is one the Senate committee missed.

The Same Mentality on Both Sides

The notion that it is dangerous to allow East-West meetings of scientists is one that the Internal Security Committee shares with its Soviet counterparts. Senator Dodd, in his introduction to the report as vice-chairman of the committee, says our scientists go to these meetings "with an open mind, full of trust and a desire to communicate and cooperate. The Communist scientist comes to these conferences with carefully defined political directives." Senator Dodd concludes, however, that "given the facts, and properly prepared, the free scientist can be more than a match for the Communist scientist." There is a mirror image parallel between Dodd's words and those of a Czech Communist magazine quoted at page 86 of the report. This says, "In some countries, especially in the USA, they use the scientist in an organized manner to establish contacts with scientists and educators in the Peoples Democratic countries, and thus they try to create a channel for the infusion of a foreign ideology into the countries of the socialist camp. . . . It is, however, necessary to help our scientists, to arm them with arguments, creative ideas of scientific socialism and political information. Only then will they be able to resist. . . ." The mentality is the same.

Senator Dodd says he is sure our scientist can win in such a contest "precisely because he is not the captive of an inflexible political dogma." But the impact of this report is to warn our scientists that to depart from inflexible cold war dogma is to risk a smearing by his committee. Every generous impulse toward peace is presented as sinister. Bertrand Russell, the noblest philosopher of our time, is pictured as the tool of a conspiracy. The story of Soviet espionage is rehashed. The shadow of the witch hunt begins to fall in these pages on two of the President's closest advisers, Jerome Wiesner and W. W. Rostow, both participants in the Pugwash meetings. Cyrus Eaton is smeared again for helping break the ice between East and West, and for having dared to criticize the head of our secret police. And Dodd in this report pursues his vendetta against Linus Pauling and the campaign for cessation of nuclear testing. Fortunately the report, though intended to be a pre-summit bombshell, turned out to be a dud. The press gave it scant attention; the old McCarthy odor was too strong.

Not Enough to Hate Communism— You've Got to Love the FBI, Too

"As the philosophical initiator of the London appeal and the subsequent Pugwash Conferences, Lord Bertrand Russell has set the background and tone of these Conferences. It is true that since 1920, Russell has carried on an energetic and continuous theoretical struggle against the forces of communism. He admits that, 'For a while after the death of Stalin, I, like others, had hopes that the Soviet regime was improving. These hopes have been shattered by events in Hungary'. Simultaneously, however, and for some unexplained psychological reason, the British philosopher has entered upon a frenetic crusade against our Federal Bureau of Investigation and the American courts. In this crusade he demonstrates close ideological kinship with Cyrus S. Eaton, fellow initiator of the Pugwash Conferences."

—The Pugwash Conferences. A Staff Analysis released by Senate Internal Security Committee, May 28, p. 39.

How An Innocent U.S. Scientist Was Seized by A Sturdy Russian Waitress

"Unfortunately, the subcommittee has not been apprised in any detail of the proceedings and the general social atmosphere which prevailed at the Pugwash conferences as a result of Cyrus Eaton's hospitality. But we do have a description of the techniques employed by Soviet scientists in their dealings with their American conferees. We cite as a possible pattern the story told by Dr. George D. Cartwright, an American meteorologist who accompanied a Soviet expedition to the Antarctic in 1958. We quote in part from his article in the Saturday Evening Post:

" 'I am a meteorologist. My primary interests are in forecasting weather. . . . On Christmas Day I was still the same quiet, rather retiring meteorologist. . . . In August I had been assigned by our Government as the first American to accompany a Russian scientific expedition to the south polar regions. . . .

" 'How could I foresee on December 25 that within four days, half seasick and carrying more vodka than was good for me, I would be struggling through a toast in Russian . . . or that at the big 'formal' New Year's Eve celebration aboard ship, in heavy weather, I would actually be dancing. . . . Late in the evening, I was seized—despite my protests —by a tall, sturdy young Russian waitress. . . .'

"Dr. Cartwright apparently suffered no ill effects from this treatment, but it is conceivable that some weaker scientist might not be so fortunate."

—The Pugwash Conference, A Staff Analysis released by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, May 28, p. 86.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But Frankfurter-Harlan "Balancing" Endangers Separation of Church and State

Supreme Court Majority Follows Madison In Upholding Sunday Blue Laws

Though Sunday blue laws have been a feature of the American landscape since the first days of theocratic rule in Puritan New England and every State but Alaska restricts business activity on Sunday, the Supreme Court had never passed on their constitutionality before last week. The closest the Court came to the question was in 1950 when it dismissed an appeal from a unanimous decision by the New York Court of Appeals upholding the conviction of a Jewish butcher for selling meat on Sunday (*People v. Friedman*, 302 NY 75). At that time the Court merely held in a per curiam opinion that it saw no Federal question. This implied as the Court ruled explicitly last Monday, that Sunday closing laws do not conflict with the First Amendment, which says Congress "shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. . . ."

Two Categories of Cases

Four appeals from three separate States were before the Court. These fell into two categories. One involved the general question of whether a Sunday closing law is a religious or a civil regulation. The Court decided 8 to 1—only Mr. Justice Douglas dissenting—that it was civil and secular. The other category of cases involved the question of whether Sunday closing laws are unconstitutional when they place a burden on sects—Jewish, Seventh Day Adventist—which keep other days than Sunday as their Sabbath. Here the Court split 6-to-3, Brennan and Stewart joining Douglas in dissent.

These are close questions; it is not surprising that they required nine separate opinions adding up to some 50,000 words. The Justices were interpreting constitutional provisions born of an atmosphere strikingly different from our own time with its suffocating religious cant. Indeed were anyone to express himself today in the anti-clerical way of Jefferson and Madison, the fathers of religious liberty in America, he would be regarded as subversive. The most hallowed precedent on the side of the majority is that Madison himself sponsored a bill in Virginia "for Punishing . . . Sabbath Breakers" and saw no inconsistency between Sunday closing laws and the absolute separation of Church and State for which he fought successfully in Virginia and later in Congress. The view had already been well established by the time of Blackstone that Sunday rest laws had a secular social utility and this seems to have been the view of Madison.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter with Mr. Justice Harlan did not, however, agree with the reasoning of the Chief Justice and the majority. Instead of finding a way out as they did by declaring that the Sunday day of rest is now a secular institution, Frankfurter and Harlan applied familiar "balancing" techniques. They found that in these cases "the impediment to which the regulation subjects those whose religious practices are curtailed by it" was "demonstrably outweighed" by "the value to the state of achieving the object of a particular regulation." This reduces the First Amendment's explicit language on religion (as Frankfurter and Harlan have already reduced its plain language on freedom of press, speech and assembly) to the cloudy vagueness of the due process clause. Here lies danger to separation of church and state whenever a majority may determine that some other consideration "outweighs" it.

The Pictures Came Out Fine—Only the Invasion Was Blurred

"Laughlin AFB, Texas—Nothing has been said, but a U-2 photo plane—the same type that did high altitude reconnaissance over Russia—flew over Cuba just before the abortive rebel landings. The mission—one of the last from this soon-to-be-closed base—gave the CIA a set of near-perfect pictures of Cuban airfields (and the planes on them) and military bases."

—"Pentagon Whispers", Newsweek, May 22

Mr. Justice Douglas: What We Americans Have Become and What We Could Be

"While Americans have freedom that few other people ever knew, the cliches that Madison Avenue exploits are distortions. . . . We speak of the free press. Yet a man without ten million dollars would have a difficult time to establish a printing plant adequate to compete with our prominent papers. . . . Big government, big business, big unions mean that men and women more and more march to a tune played by a few superiors.

"We have been so vastly regimented that almost overnight opinion is shaped to fit a synthetic image. Mossadegh—the first man who brought democracy to Persia's villages and who strived to get a constitutional monarchy—became overnight at the hands of our press a clown, a demagogue, a neo-communist. Kassim—an ardent nationalist—was pictured as a tool of communism, when in truth communism suffered in his regime the worst setback it has known. Castro became the symbol of evil. . . .

"We have also suffered a decline in ethics. . . . The Pentagon official looks forward to the day when he is Vice President of the company doing business with the Pentagon. The forester looks forward to the time when he adds to his retirement pay by getting on the payroll of the lumber company that he is supposed to keep in bounds while he is an official of the Forest Service. . . .

"Truman and Eisenhower taught us to find security in arms, not in ideas. For years we took massive doses of tranquilizers that helped us think that if our society were scourged of the so-called 'subversive' we could be safe behind our Maginot Lines of bombs, bombers, and fighter planes. . . . The world, we thought, must be remade in our image. The man out of step with American free enterprise was a dangerous man. That intolerance of ours was close competitor to the communist's; each demanded its particular type of conformity. . . .

"I hope that America's only dream of empire will be the common good of humanity. I hope that America will come to realize that her strength is not in fire power but in ideas of justice, tolerance, equality. One expression of tolerance would be feeding the people of the world—even those who have been taught to despise us. One place to start is Red China where the rice bowls are getting empty. Offering to feed even those who differ with us would recast America in the image of Lincoln—the man who set us a standard known the world over but almost forgotten at home, 'with malice toward none, with charity for all'."

—Mr. Justice Douglas, at a Seminar on the American Character, Center for Study of Democratic Institutions, Washington, May 29.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Madison Avenue Nonsense About Our Being A Revolutionary Power, Too

(Continued from Page One)

difficult to avoid. The problem is not solved merely by standing firm on West Berlin; the situation is intrinsically infirm; negotiation should be seen as a chance to make West Berlin's position safer by stabilizing the whole German picture. This might conceivably be bought by the recognition of East Germany. De facto recognition will be the result anyway if Moscow signs a separate pact; we are not going to war if East Germans behave correctly and sign the passes for traffic to Berlin.

Both Sides Want to Dominate the World

The other two main problems which Mr. Kennedy had to discuss with Mr. Khrushchov also require a flexibility the former seemed to promise in the early days of his Administration but which vanished after the Cuban invasion failed. Much is made on our side of the fact that the Russians and their allies see wars of colonial liberation as "just wars" exempt from their general stand for peaceful co-existence; we see this as evidence of a Communist plot to dominate the world by "nibbling away" (such metaphors reflect the childish nightmares which underlie our foreign policy) at its colonial edges. But we, too, see these struggles as inevitable and just—otherwise why did we vote against Portugal on Angola? And we, too, seek to control these areas of change in a similar ambition to dominate the world, to make it safe for free enterprise, which is really what Mr. Kennedy's new Freedom Doctrine means. In Laos, it was we, not the Russians, who began the process of subverting a neutral government under Souvanna Phouma and forced him to call for Russian aid when the Thais imposed a blockade against his capital. Mr. Kennedy cannot talk to Mr. Khrushchov about this in the terms of our propaganda which has reversed the truth about Laos; they may not be able to communicate at all.

The most difficult problem seems insoluble without a different international climate—this is the Russian insistence on vetoes in international machinery. In all objectivity we must recognize that this is, at least in part, a reaction to a situation in which the Russians have been in a permanent minority in international organizations we control and particularly to the humiliating way the UN drove the Russians out of the Congo and let the Belgians back in. Now this begins to haunt us in the nuclear test talks; an agreement is impossible with a Russian veto; the Senate would never accept it. But the Russians are unwilling to open their country to inspection unless assured that real disarmament will follow, and Mr. Kennedy in again beefing up the military budget shows less interest than ever in disarmament. *We must never forget that the arms race, the cold war and world tension represent the path of least resistance for an American president seeking some way to maintain a high level of economic activity at home and of colonial expenditure abroad.* This is visible again in the President's new message to Congress which was, we suppose, designed to frighten the Russians. But the cold war Mr. Kennedy threatens is a policy that failed before, and for which they are better prepared now. It doesn't frighten or impress the Russians. They *and* our allies would be more impressed if we had the resolution to resume relations with Cuba and win it away from Moscow, or if Mr. Kennedy instead of talking about his freedom doctrine for export were personally to campaign for it in the South. Above all, after our recent attempt to destroy Latin America's first real revolution in years by force, let's not continue this Madison Avenue nonsense about our being a revolutionary power, too. 1776 was a long time ago and if Thomas Jefferson ever came back to today's Washington, he'd soon be subpoenaed as un-American.

A Negro Paper Replies to 'Cool Off'

"Mr. Kennedy with the issuance of his statement Wednesday appears bent on taking on the role of a man who kicks over the pail after milking the cow. In so many words, young Mr. Kennedy asks Americans to abrogate their constitutional rights to the red-necks and ruffians of Alabama and Mississippi. 'Delay travelling through these two states,' he asks, 'until the present state of confusion and danger has passed and an atmosphere of reason and normalcy has been restored.'

"This is disappointing advice. It is especially so coming from the nation's top law enforcement officer. If there were a series of bank robberies, Mr. Kennedy would not dare ask the banks in any given section to close."

—Editorial in Washington Afro-American, May 27

Many Thanks to Those Readers Actively Getting Us New Subscriptions — We Ask Others To Try It, Too

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

6/5/61

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.

Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Ail Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED